Few Seniors Met Standards Set by Excellence Panel, N.C.E.S. Says

WASHINGTON—Fewer than 3 percent of the nation's 1982 high-school seniors met the graduation requirements recommended this spring by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, according to a new report.

The National Center for Education Statistics recently compared the transcripts of more than 12,000 students in both public and private schools with the recommendations outlined in the commission's report, *A Nation at Risk*.

The report, released last April, called on state and local school officials to require graduates to complete a minimum of 4 years of English, 3 years each of mathematics, science, and social studies, and a half-year of computer science. *(See Education Week, April 27, 1983.)*

The N.C.E.S. analysis indicated that only 2.6 percent of the 1982 graduates had completed course work in those "New Basics" promoted by the commission.

In addition, the excellence commission "strongly recommended" that college-bound students complete at least two years of study in a foreign language. Only 1.8 percent of all graduates and 3.7 percent of those who planned to attend college for four or more years met that requirement, the N.C.E.S. found.

"These findings further prove the need for higher expectations and more rigorous requirements in our elementary and secondary schools," said Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell in a statement accompanying the report. "It is encouraging to note that school boards and administrators are already aware of these needs.

"Increased standards now being implemented will likely ensure that future high-school graduating classes will present a more encouraging picture," Mr. Bell added.

The N.C.E.S. survey also indicated that while the vast majority of students failed to meet the minimum 13.5 credits entailed in "The New Basics," they had accumulated an average of 21.8 credits by taking courses other than those regarded as important by the excellence commission.

'Cafeteria-Style Curriculum'

Mr. Bell said that finding supports the commission's allegation that some secondary schools offer a "cafeteria-style curriculum" that has been "homogenized, diluted, and diffused."

"This is bad news," the Secretary said. "[But] the good news is that we have a nationwide movement underway that will change this picture."

The N.C.E.S. survey was conducted as part of "High School and Beyond," its massive longitudinal study of students who were sophomores and seniors in 1980.

The center has examined the educational achievements of these groups of students every two years. —T.M.

Percentage of 1982 Graduates Who Met Various Sets of Curriculum Requirements, by Educational Aspirations

Requirements (years)	All graduates	Educational aspirations: High-school graduation	Some postsecondary but less than 4 years of college	4 years of college or more	Aspirations not indicated
All English (4) Mathematics (3) Science (3) Social studies (3) Computer science (.5) Foreign language (2)	1.8%	0.5%	0.4%	3.7%	0.5%
All except foreign language English (4) Mathematics (3) Science (3) Social studies (3) Computer science (.5)	2.6	0.6	1.0	5.0	1.1
All except computer science English (4) Mathematics (3) Science (3) Social studies (3) Foreign language (2)	8.4	2.2	4.2	15.6	4.2
All except foreign language and computer science English (4) Mathematics (3) Science (3) Social studies (3)	13.4	4.8	8.0	22.6	8.7

Source: National Center for Education Statistics

The Excellence Commission's 'New Basic' Requirements Compared With 1982 Graduates' Averages

Subject	Minimal standards	Average number of credits earned
	(in Carnegie units)	
Social studies	3.0	3.1
English	4.0	3.8
Mathematics	3.0	2.6
Foreign language	2.0	1.1
Science	3.0	2.2
Computer science	0.5	0.1
Total, excluding foreign language	13.5	11.8
Total, including foreign language	15.5	12.9

Panel Hears Children Tell of Nuclear War Fears

By Tom Mirga

WASHINGTON—"A lot of kids are scared they might not have a future because of nuclear war," said Jessica Fiedler, an 11-year-old from Muscantine, Iowa, to members of a House committee last week. "I want a future, too."

Jessica was one of three children to testify before the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families last week about their fears of nuclear war.

Her testimony—and that of the other children—provided spectators in the packed hearing room with a dramatic portrait of an age group said to be deeply troubled by living under the threat of nuclear destruction.

But their testimony came over the strong objection of Republicans on the panel, who alleged that the hearing was politically motivated and claimed that defense policy was not "an appropriate topic of discussion for the committee, even if the witnesses are children."

"I question the meaning of 'bipartisanship' as defined by this committee's majority," said Representative Thomas J. Bliley Jr., Republican of Virginia, at the beginning of the session. "Apparently, it thinks that it can do anything that it wants without taking minority views into account."

He added that if the Democrats on the committee were "serious about the topic of nuclear war," they would have opened for discussion the question of controversial curriculum guides and educational comic books "that have vivid pictures guaranteed to keep your children awake at night."

Gerald Orjuela, a 12-year-old from Brooklyn, N.Y., told members of the panel that he assumed that they "are all sensible and intelligent people."

"I'm also sure that Yuri Andropov is intelligent and that President Reagan is intelligent," he said. "But why is it that we don't use our intelligence for peace, instead of for war?

"We're frightened that a lot of countries have the bomb," Gerald continued. "We're frightened that we might be hit. Why can't we live in a world with one rule—peace?"

"I think instead of worrying so much about nuclear war, we should do something about it," added Jessica Fiedler. "But I'm still scared. It's scary to think about the world being destroyed, and nothing is left."

Ursell Austin, a 16-year-old from Oakland, Calif., told the committee

Continued on Page 13

Action To Be Sought on Tax-Credit Bill

In coming weeks, the Reagan Administration will try to move its tuition tax-credit bill through the Senate by attaching it as a rider to another piece of legislation that has a good chance of being passed, educators and Senate sources say.

The Senate Finance Committee approved the Administration's bill, S 528, last May, but the Republican leadership in the Senate has been reluctant to push for a full Senate vote, for fear that it would be defeated.

That bill, introduced by Sen. Robert J. Dole, Republican of Kansas, would permit tax credits of up to $100 in 1983, $200 in 1984, and $300 thereafter for parents with children in nonpublic schools. The credits would equal, but not exceed, one-half of tuition costs for each child.

Administration officials are urging Sen. Orrin G. Hatch, Republican of Utah, to include the bill as a rider to S 1285, the Senate version of the mathematics and science legislation before the Congress, according to a Senate aide.

The mathematics and science bill will reportedly be considered by the full Senate by the end of this month; Mr. Hatch is to be its floor manager.

However, Mr. Hatch is resisting such a maneuver, the aide said, adding that the Senator "doesn't want to turn the math-science bill into a Christmas tree." If Senator Hatch does not include the tuition tax-credit provision in the math-science bill when it is brought to the floor of the Senate, the Administration will have try to find another Senator to do so, according to the Senate aide.

President Reagan outlined the new strategy in a speech to 27 representatives of organizations that support tuition tax credits at a White House meeting Sept. 16. At the 30-minute meeting, Mr. Reagan assured those present that "he was doing everything he could" in support of tax-credit legislation, according to one participant, Sister Renee Oliver, associate director of Citizens for Educational Freedom.

Mr. Reagan reiterated his support for tuition tax credits publicly last week in a speech at the University of South Carolina, where he was awarded an honorary degree. He also repeated his support for a constitutional amendment allowing prayer in schools and merit pay for public-school teachers. —T.T.

NEW BILLS

Following is a summary of bills recently introduced in Congress that may be of interest to those in elementary and secondary education. Copies of the bills may be obtained by writing the Senate Documents Office, Rm. S325, U. S. Capitol Bldg., Washington 20510 or the House Documents Office, Rm. H226, U. S. Capitol Bldg., Washington 20515.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HR 3913—Education Appropriations. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1984, and for other purposes. By Representative Natcher (D-Ky.).

IN FEDERAL AGENCIES

Education Department regulations. The Education Department announced, in the Sept. 20 *Federal Register*, its intention to review, and possibly revise the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). These regulations govern certain fiscal and administrative procedures. They will be reviewed to find ways to reduce regulatory burdens and save money. The purpose of this notice is to present issues and invite comments to help the Secretary of Education when he reviews these regulations. Comments should be in written form and be submitted on or before Nov. 21 to Mr. William B. Riley, EDGAR Staff, Office of Management, E.D., Room 3161, FOB-6, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202; (202) 245-2853.

Education statistics. The Education Department announced, in the Sept. 19 *Federal Register*, an open meeting of the Advisory Council on Education Statistics on Oct. 6-7 at 1200 19th Street, N.W., Room 823, Washington, D.C. 20208. Contact: Robena S. Gore, Executive Director, Advisory Council on Education Statistics, E.D., 1200 19th Street, N.W., Brown Building, Room 723-B, Washington, D.C. 20208; (202) 254-6227.

International education. The National Advisory Board on International Education Programs of the Education Department announced, in the Sept. 15 *Federal Register*, two open meetings of the Subcommittee on Critical Needs in International Education on Sept. 29 and Oct. 25, 9 A.M.-5 P.M., in Washington. Contact: Kenneth D. Whitehead or Marguerite A. Follett, International Education Programs Office, ROB-3, Room 3916, E.D., 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202; (202) 245-9691.

Juvenile justice. The Justice Department announced, in the Sept. 16 *Federal Register*, that it will hold the quarterly meeting of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention on Sept. 30, 9:30 A.M.-11:30 A.M. in Washington. The meeting will be in the Main Floor Auditorium of the Hubert Horatio Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Ave., S.W. Contact: Roberta Dorn, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 6330 Indiana Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531; (202) 724-7655.

Student loans. The Education Department published, in the Sept. 20 *Federal Register*, sample cases and expected parental contributions for the approval of need-analysis systems, and announced the closing date of Oct. 20 for the transmittal of information for the National Direct Student Loan and College Work-Study Opportunity Grant programs. Contact: Margaret O. Henry or Paula M. Husselmann; (202) 245-9720.

HEARINGS

The following Congressional hearings of interest to those in the field of elementary and secondary education have been scheduled for upcoming months. Because times, places, and witnesses frequently change with little advance notice, it is advisable to check with the committees by telephone on or near the appointed dates.

SENATE

Vocational education. Oct. 18 and 25. Oversight hearings on vocational education. Contact: Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities (202) 224-2562.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Child nutrition. Sept. 28. Oversight hearings on child nutrition. Contact: Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education (202) 225-4368.

Education Department. Sept. 27 and 29. Hearings on the reorganization of the Education Department. Contact: Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education (202) 225-4368.

House Panel Told Block Grants Impede Desegregation Efforts

Continued from Page 1

David S. Tatel, director of the office for civil rights in the former Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from 1977 to 1979 and a member of the board of directors of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, testified that the block-grants program has had a "devastating impact" on school systems' desegregation plans.

He noted that only five states took such factors as minority enrollment or racial isolation into account in their block-grant funding formulas last year, although 43 states benefited from the ESAA program the year before. And he cited a study of about 1,200 school districts last spring by the American Association of School Administrators that found that only 5.7 percent of school systems used Chapter 2 money for programs that previously would have been funded under ESAA.

In 1981, ESAA provided school systems with $149.2 million in aid to support such desegregation-related efforts as magnet schools, remedial programs, staff development, and community relations. Last year, the states received approximately $455-million under Chapter 2.

Several of the 20 witnesses called before the subcommittee urged Congress to pass legislation that would reauthorize ESAA. One measure, which would re-establish ESAA as a categorical program with a funding ceiling of $100 million, has passed in the House and is pending in the Senate.

Mr. Pendleton and others criticized the Education Department for failing to issue regulations requiring states to target Chapter 2 funds for desegregation programs in inner cities and other areas with large minority populations. "The department proposed no standards for evaluating states' formulas or requirements that states show they would concentrate Chapter 2 funds on the neediest school districts, as Congress intended," Mr. Pendleton told the subcommittee.

Secretary of Education Terrel H. Bell said in a Jan. 31 letter to the Council of the Great City Schools that "nothing in the [E.C.I.A.] law requires the Department of Education to promulgate enforceable standards for determining whether state criteria for adjusting the allocations are reasonably calculated to produce an equitable distribution of funds." This summer, the department issued the final version of its nonbinding Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 guidelines.

Anne T. Henderson of the National Committee for Citizens in Education testified that the nation's 30 largest school systems received much less federal aid under Chapter 2 than they did under the 29 categorical programs that were folded into it. She said those districts, which enroll nearly half of the nation's minority students, received 45 percent less in federal funds during 1982-83 than during the year before.

Ms. Henderson said that under Chapter 2 there "has been a massive redistribution of federal funds away from states serving large numbers of poor, nonwhite children."

Witnesses testified that states, on average, distributed 70 percent of their Chapter 2 aid to school systems on the basis of enrollment and 30 percent on the basis of the number of a system's "high-cost" students, such as the handicapped or disadvantaged.

Representative Robert S. Walker, Republican of Pennsylvania and ranking minority member on the subcommittee, said during the hearing that he thought such a formula adequately accounted for the needs of high-cost students.

Leonard M. Britton, superintendent of schools in Dade County, Fla., responded that "there must be an unequal distribution of dollars because the needs of students in different places are unequal."

Early in the hearing, Representative Walker and Representative Ted S. Weiss, Democrat of New York and chairman of the subcommittee, engaged in a somewhat heated exchange.

"I must express my concern about the one-sided approach reflected in the list of prospective witnesses," Mr. Walker said, adding that he had not been given the list of witnesses until 24 hours before the hearing. Mr. Weiss said that, on the contrary, the Republican staff of the committee had been given a witness list several days prior to the hearing.

Gary Bauer, deputy under secretary of education for planning, budget, and evaluation, testified that Congress intended that Chapter 2 address state and locally determined priorities, minimize paperwork, and be designed and implemented by "those closest to students and their parents."

He noted that local school officials responding to surveys done for his office said that Chapter 2 has reduced the administrative burden on them and has afforded them greater discretion over how federal aid is used.

However, several local educators who testified at the hearing said there was too little guidance for school systems concerning the proper use of Chapter 2 funds. "In practical terms," said Mr. Britton, "the brevity of the statute, the limited scope of the regulations, the nonbinding characteristics of federal guidance, and the extension of rulemaking authority to state education agencies have resulted in confusion, contradiction, and a general lack of clarity at the district level."

Studies cited at the hearing have found that school systems used about half of their Chapter 2 funds for books, computers, and other materials.

Ms. Henderson noted in her testimony that many school systems are administering their block grants in much the same way that they administered grants they received through Title IV-B of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which also provided assistance in the purchasing of instructional materials.

Studies Evaluate Schools' First Year Experiences With Chapter 2 Block Grants

State	State application (1982-83 school year)	State set-aside	Percentage of remainder distributed on basis of enrollment/special needs	Percentages of special needs: Low income	Sparse population	Tax effort	Limited English proficient	Gifted and talented	Low-high achievement	Desegregation	Handicapped	Other
Alabama	$7,633,794	10.0	80%/20%	8.0		2.0		10.0				
Alaska	2,187,360	20.0	30/70	25.0	25.0						20.0	
Arizona	5,098,049	10.0	98/02	*	*			*				
Arkansas	4,373,525	20.0	90/10	10.0								
California	41,291,513	19.5	42/58	8.5	1.5		5.0			43.0		
Colorado	5,222,993	20.0	83/17	16.0	1.0					*		
Connecticut	5,626,052	20.0	21/79	60.0						18.0		1.0
Delaware	2,187,360	20.0	70/30	10.0				10.0		0.0	10.0	
Florida	15,925,153	17.5	64/36						36.0			
Georgia	10,864,740	20.0	50/50	50.0								
Hawaii**	2,187,360	20.0	100/0									
Idaho	2,187,360	20.0	85/15	10.0	5.0							
Illinois	21,163,056	20.0	70/30	30.0								
Indiana	10,562,428	20.0	83/17	15.0	2.0							
Iowa	5,330,630	20.0	75/25	20.0			5.0					
Kansas	4,129,341	20.0	88/12	9.0	1.0						2.0	
Kentucky	7,057,931	20.0	84/16	7.0	7.0	2.0						
Louisiana	8,545,996	20.0	85/15	10.0							5.0	
Maine	2,187,360	20.0	60/40	40.0								
Maryland	7,896,681	20.0	80/20	11.5							8.5	
Massachusetts	10,173,811	20.0	40/60	60.0								
Michigan	18,231,652	20.0	58/42		6.0				18.0	18.0		
Minnesota	7,629,692	20.0	82/18	12.0	6.0							
Mississippi	5,283,645	20.0	95/5	*	*						*	*
Missouri	8,895,073	20.0	78.5/21.5	18.5	3.0							
Montana	2,187,360	20.0	71/29	9.0	2.0	15.0						
Nebraska	2,861,216	20.0	75/25	5.0							20.0	
Nevada	2,187,360	20.0	90/10	10.0								
New Hampshire	2,187,360	20.0	50/50		*	*					*	
New Jersey	13,484,913	20.0	30/70	20.0				5.0	26.0	20.0		
New Mexico	2,865,553	20.0	70/30		30.0							
New York	31,340,643	20.0	86.5/13.6		0.3		0.2		13.0			
North Carolina	11,047,452	20.0	70/30	30.0								
North Dakota	2,187,360	20.0	87/13	9.0	4.0							
Ohio	20,354,591	20.0	75/25	13.0	0.04	10.0					1.8	
Oklahoma	5,484,556	20.0	80/20	5.0	10.0						5.0	
Oregon	4,631,497	20.0	70/30	9.0	0.5		2.5	4.0		7.0	7.0	
Pennsylvania	20,966,546	17.0	60/40	35.0	5.0							
Rhode Island	2,187,360	20.0	60/40	23.0			6.0				11.0	
South Carolina	6,203,610	20.0	70/30	30.0								
South Dakota	2,187,360	20.0	90/10		5.0						5.0	
Tennessee	8,578,920	20.0	*	*								
Texas	27,672,974	20.0	73/27	15.0			5.0				7.0	
Utah	3,088,956	20.0	77/23		*						*	*
Vermont	2,187,360	20.0	60/40	31.0	9.0							
Virginia	9,824,822	20.0	65/35	18.0					17.0			
Washington	7,348,289	20.0	50/50	15.0			5.0	10.0		20.0		
West Virginia	3,662,769	20.0	90/10	5.0							5.0	
Wisconsin	8,919,131	20.0	50/50	50.0								
Wyoming	2,187,360	20.0	*		*	*		*				

* Distribution based on a weighted per-pupil formula that takes into account the high cost of educating special-needs children.
** Hawaii has only one school district.
Source: National Commission for Citizens in Education, 1983.

Studies Evaluate State, Local Experience With Block Grants

Since last year, the first in which school systems received federal aid under Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (E.C.I.A.), a number of groups have conducted studies looking at the first year's experience with the block-grants program. Among them are:

● *No Strings Attached: An Interim Report on the New Education Block Grant*, by Anne T. Henderson of the National Committee for Citizens in Education.

The report gives the legislative history of Chapter 2, documents changes in the distribution and use of federal funds under the block grant, and discusses the governance of the new program through case studies of the experiences of seven states.

It concludes that "the formula that allocates funds from [the federal government] to the states' [school-age population] has resulted in a massive redistribution of federal funds away from states serving large numbers of poor, nonwhite children, toward more sparsely settled states with few minority children."

For further information, contact the National Committee for Citizens in Education, 410 Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, Md. 21044.

● *The New Federalism: State Responses to the 1981 Education Consolidation and Improvement Act*, by Linda Darling-Hammond and Ellen L. Marks of the Rand Corporation for the U. S. Education Department.

The study analyzes the responses of nine states, reviews the legislation creating the block grants to states, assesses the roles of various state bodies in formulating Chapter 2 policy, and analyzes the various intergovernmental relationships created by the block-grants program.

"The E.C.I.A. represents a small first step toward realigning the intergovernmental aid system in education," the authors note. "It is a small step both because the consolidated programs represent a tiny fraction of education revenues and because the amount of real deregulation accompanying the new law is minimal."

Most state officials agreed with the intent of the E.C.I.A. and thought that it created opportunities for "more effective and efficient service delivery," the authors also said. But "again and again," they added, state administrators pointed out "the numerous ambiguities created by the passage of the E.C.I.A. and its administration by the Department of Education."

For further information, contact The Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif. 90406.

● *Kaleidoscopes: Emerging Patterns of Response and Action in E.C.I.A. Case Studies of Chapter 2 in Selected States*, by Regina M. J. Kyle of E.H. White and Company for the National Institute of Education of the U. S. Education Department.

This study evaluates the effects of the implementation of Chapter 2 in nine states.

In general, the author concludes, the process of implementing their block grants "has been a smooth one" in the nine states. "State agencies have been careful and responsible in carrying out their mandates."

This study also concludes that the school systems that received funds during 1982-83 under Chapter 2 had little or no involvement with previous categorical programs and that large amounts of block-grant money is being spent on computers.

For more information, contact E.H. White and Company, 1025 Vermont Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20005.

Continued on Next Page

U.S.D.A. Bans Use of Suspect Meat in the School-Lunch Program

Continued from Page 1

the measures as "precautionary."

The investigation has sparked Congressional interest as well. Last week, Representative Tom Harkin, Democrat of Iowa and chairman of the House Agriculture Committee's Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry said that the subcommittee will hold hearings on conditions at the two plants, although he did not announce a date.

In at least one state, Illinois, officials stopped distributing the ground beef before being ordered to do so by the U.S.D.A. Donald G. Gill, state superintendent of public instruction, recommended that schools not use federally provided ground beef until the situation became clearer. Mr. Gill also sent a strongly worded telegram to Mr. Block, seeking confirmation that the meat did not pose a threat to the health of Illinois schoolchildren.

In Chicago, Ruth B. Love, superintendent of schools, also called a halt to the use of government hamburger. Gov. James R. Thompson Jr. announced in a news conference that he had ordered shipment of the suspect meat to Illinois halted.

The beef in question was supplied by Cattle King Packing Company of Denver and Nebraska Beef Packers Inc. of Gering, Neb. Both companies were the subject of an investigation by the Better Government Association (B.G.A.), a Chicago-based citizens' group, and NBC-TV's "First Camera," a new program similar in format to CBS-TV's "60 Minutes." *(See Education Week, Sept. 21, 1983.)* During the 1982-83 school year, Cattle King provided 14 percent of the ground beef used in the school-lunch program and Nebraska Beef supplied 7 percent, according to the investigative report.

Officials of the companies did not return telephone calls last week; in news reports, the owners were quoted as denying the charges.

The results of the investigation were made public on the Sept. 18 premiere of "First Camera." But according to U.S.D.A. officials, the department had started an investigation prior to issuing the ban. The officials said the department had been aware of possible violations by the plants prior to learning of the investigation, but declined to say how the alleged problems had come to their attention.

Samples of Beef

U.S.D.A. officials said they had notified school officials in states that had received the ground beef and had taken samples of beef from the two plants at 14 sites in 12 states.

School-lunch hamburger is purchased from meat packers by the Agricultural Marketing Service, a branch of the U.S.D.A., and distributed through the Food and Nutrition Service, which administers the federal school-lunch program.

The 12 states were Alabama, Arizona, California, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Kentucky, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Tennessee, and Washington. They were chosen because the inspection branch of U.S.D.A. knew that some of the beef from the packers in question had been sent to the states. As government scientists receive information on the whereabouts of the rest of the meat from other branches of the department, they will conduct further sampling.

U.S.D.A. officials said that they had "capabilities" that allowed them to track the ground beef but said that they would give access to the necessary information only to those directly involved in the program, not the general public.

Officials in some of the states that received the beef said the U.S.D.A. had told them how to identify precisely the meat from the two suppliers. Notified on Sept. 19 by the department, the states had halted use of the beef by the following day. In some cases, because it is still early in the school year, the product was still in state warehouses.

Evidence uncovered by the investigators suggests that the meat-packing firms—owned by members of the same family—used unsanitary practices and routinely processed meat that should have been condemned.

The U.S.D.A. estimates that there are about 6.4 million pounds of the ground beef currently somewhere in distribution channels between the packers and the schools.

"Routine samples" of the hamburger from Cattle King and Nebraska Beef, taken by the U.S.D.A. since October 1981, "indicate no health threat and no reports of illness associated with beef from the two plants," according to a statement issued by Secretary Block.

The investigation is being conducted by the office of the U.S.D.A. inspector general. In his Sept. 21 statement, Secretary Block said that he was "not in a position to discuss any of the details of the investigation at this time."

Site Visits and Interviews

Department sources, however, said the investigation would include both site visits and interviews with people involved with the plants.

Officials in some states that have not received any of the beef from the suspect packers said they had not asked schools to halt all use of the federally provided hamburger.

Some public-interest groups described the situation at Cattle King and Nebraska Beef as the latest evidence of problems in the federal meat-inspection program.

A survey conducted by a U.S.D.A. review board several years ago found wide disparities in inspection practices from region to region, according to an official with the Community Nutrition Institute (C.N.I.), a public-interest group. The disparities offer evidence of a lack of consistent national practices and management, according to the official.

He described a case of poultry contamination that was discovered when Georgia schoolchildren became ill after eating the chicken. An analysis revealed that the chicken was contaminated with styrene, a chemical used in the resurfacing of floors that is easily picked up by meat. Such contamination, which produces a markedly unpleasant odor, abates eventually, as the chemical breaks down into its components.

The standard procedure would be to condemn styrene-contaminated meat, according to C.N.I. But in this instance, U.S.D.A. inspection officials agreed to let the packer hold the poultry until the contamination abated, then sell it.

E.D. Block Grants Analyzed

Continued from Previous Page

• *The Effects of the Chapter 2, E.C.I.A. Consolidation on the Administrative and Paperwork Requirements for Local School Districts*, by Anne H. Hastings and Ted Bartell of Advanced Technologies Inc. for the office of planning, budget, and evaluation of the U. S. Education Department. The purpose of the report was to analyse how Chapter 2 affected the paperwork requirements of local school administrators who receive the federal aid.

The authors found that 11 of the 12 local Chapter 2 administrators interviewed agreed that "the block grant reduced the administrative and paperwork burden on schools" and that the two most positive aspects of the Chapter 2 program are the simplified application procedures and the discretion that is afforded local school officials.

Some of the local officials surveyed, however, said the Chapter 2 program has resulted in the loss of funds directed specifically at innovative local research and demonstration projects, the weakening of controls "to ensure that funds are expended according to the law and for purposes that are in the national interest, and the loss of incentives to plan projects carefully, set objectives and evaluate results." For more information, contact Advanced Technologies Inc., 7923 Jones Branch Drive, McLean, Va. 22102.

• *Fiscal Effects of the Chapter 2, E.C.I.A. Block Grant on the Largest Districts and Cities*, by Richard K. Jung and Ted Bartell of Advanced Technologies Inc. for the office of planning, budget, and evaluation of the U. S. Education Department. This study compares funding patterns under Chapter 2 in 28 of the nation's largest school systems to the funding levels under the former categorical programs in the two years prior to the implementation of the block grants.

Twelve of the 28 school systems received more aid under Chapter 2 than they did the year before; 16 schools systems received less, the authors found. Overall, the 28 school systems studied received 30 percent less in federal funds last year under Chapter 2 than they did the year before under various categorical programs.

The researchers also found that county school systems, in general, "fared better" under Chapter 2 than did city school systems; systems with low proportions of nonwhite students tended to receive higher Chapter 2 allocations. "The findings of this analysis," the authors note, "suggest that some attention be focused on alternatives for assisting districts undergoing court-ordered desegregation, which realized substantial budget reduction under Chapter 2."

For more information, contact Advanced Technologies Inc., 7923 Jones Branch Drive, McLean, Va. 22102.

—T.T.

Commission Fields Questions on Reform Costs

Continued from Page 1

schools come from families on public assistance, one local educator said that it was "unfair to leave an excessive burden of additional cost at the state and city level."

Commission members responded that the task of determining a price tag for their reform program "was not in the commission's charter," and Secretary Bell reiterated the Reagan Administration's policy that "the major funding role for education ought to rest with the states."

"Education is to state governments what national defense is to the federal government," he said.

The purpose of the meeting—the eighth in a series of 11 regional conferences—was to continue discussion about *A Nation At Risk*, the commission's final report; to hear from governors, state education leaders, and legislators what has been done in their states to implement the recommendation of the report; and to "spur further initiatives," according to members of the commission.

The conference, which was held at the University of Pennsylvania, attracted more than 1,000 participants from Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. (Another forum on the recommendations of the excellence commission was held last week in Athens, Ga. Others will be held in Kingsport, Tenn., and Seattle.)

Gov. Thomas H. Kean of New Jersey outlined the proposals—to raise beginning teachers' salaries, establish a master-teacher program, and open teaching posts to candidates not trained in education schools—that he presented to a special joint session of the New Jersey Legislature earlier this month. *(See Education Week Sept. 14, 1983.)*

New Jersey educators present at the conference expressed doubt that the legislature would approve the package.

"The ideas are good, but are they practical?" asked Carol A. Hoeh, vice-president of the Ocean County, N.J., school board and a 1st-grade teacher.

Ms. Hoeh said that taxes are already high in the state and that the upgraded salaries for new teachers would upset those who have worked in the schools for four years and still do not make $18,500. "If we are going to raise salaries, we need to upgrade the whole salary scale for teachers," she said.

Other educators took issue with the Governor's merit-pay plan and raised several questions: "How do we determine who is a master teacher?" "What do we do when 6 percent of teachers deserve to be master teachers, but we have funding only to recognize 5 percent in that way?" "What do we say to parents when their child does not have the master teacher this year?"

Officials from Pennsylvania and Delaware also described their states' education-reform efforts.

In Pennsylvania, final adoption of new state minimum high-school graduation requirements (that would raise the number of required credits from 13 to 21 and triple the number of credits required in mathematics and science) is slated for November, according to Richard C. Wilburn, the state's chief education officer. State officials are also reviewing curriculum standards, evaluating the "preparation, supervision, and recognition" of teachers, and considering a statewide testing program to assess student progress. Pennsylvania is one of the few states without a testing program, according to Mr. Wilburn.

The Delaware Legislature this year allocated additional funds to decrease class size, introduce teacher competency tests, develop basic-skills programs, and improve programs for the gifted and talented, according to Lt. Gov. Michael N. Castle. He added that the state was in the midst of a comprehensive review of education in grades K-12.

Gov. Pierre S. du Pont 4th of Delaware called on educators to "lay out the challenge" for school improvement by working "to motivate, interest, and involve parents." The job of school improvement requires "more than the support of educators and interest groups," he said.

"We need to involve parents in the system. The letter home sent by teachers can be a channel of good news," said Penny R. Cipolone, a teacher at Gateway Regional High School in Woodbury Heights, N.J., who last year was named the state's teacher of the year.

She urged teachers, who are "besieged by paperwork, student council meetings, and milk money," to raise their grading standards; to "refuse to change the 62 grade to 65" to pass students who are failing; to collect—and correct—homework assignments; and to encourage good students to pursue teaching as a career.

Delinquency Aid

Continued from Page 8

school officials of the goals and responsibilities of people in the schools. Each of the project's seven schools employed two staff members to run the program and the central administration employed three additional employees.

"I thought the [regulations and paperwork were] going to be perceived as burdensome in Charleston," Mr. Gottfredson said. "I thought we were going to get a little rebellion, but instead we got people saying, 'Gee, I'm glad I know what my job is.' "

The Hopkins report argued that criticism of past efforts to reduce juvenile delinquency was misdirected. The report said that many juvenile programs were developed but never fully implemented. Many techniques that would reduce juvenile delinquency in schools have been "underutilized or . . . misapplied in schools," the report said.

Some of the early juvenile-delinquency programs, Mr. Gottfredson added, amounted to little more than "putting up basketball courts" to keep students occupied.